DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 850 EC 143 112

AUTHOR Potter, Margaret; Mirkin, Phyllis
TITLE Instructional Planning and Implementation Practices of Elementary and Secondary Resource Room Teachers: Is There a Difference?
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Inst. for Research on Learning Disabilities.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO IRLD-RR-65
PUB DATE Jan 82
CONTRACT 300-80-0622
NOTE 41p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Delivery Systems; Elementary Education; *Learning Disabilities; *Program Development; *Resource Room Programs; Secondary Education; Student Evaluation; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

A national sample of 53 elementary teachers and 34 secondary school teachers who provide Level III resource room service to learning disabled students was asked to complete a survey on program planning and implementation practices. Statistical analyses of responses revealed no differences of practical value between the practices of elementary and secondary level teachers; however, there was a great deal of variability within the responses of both groups. Results further indicated that aside from the initial development of the individualized education program, objective evaluation information generally is not used to make ongoing instructional decisions. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED218850

University of Minnesota

Research Report No. 65

INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION PRACTICES OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY RESOURCE ROOM TEACHERS : IS THERE A DIFFERENCE?

Margaret Potter and Phyllis Mirkin

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

IRLD

Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James Ysseldyke

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC143112

IRLD

Director: James E. Ysseldyke

Associate Director: Phyllis K. Mirkin

The Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities is supported by a contract (300-80-0622) with the Office of Special Education, Department of Education, through Title VI-G of Public Law 91-230. Institute investigators are conducting research on the assessment/decision-making/intervention process as it relates to learning disabled students.

During 1980-1983, Institute research focuses on four major areas:

- Referral
- Identification/Classification
- Intervention Planning and Progress Evaluation
- Outcome Evaluation

Additional information on the Institute's research objectives and activities may be obtained by writing to the Editor at the Institute (see Publications list for address).

The research reported herein was conducted under government sponsorship. Contractors are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent the official position of the Office of Special Education.

Research Report No. 65

INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION PRACTICES OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY RESOURCE ROOM TEACHERS: IS THERE A DIFFERENCE?

Margaret Potter and Phyllis Mirkin

Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities

University of Minnesota

January, 1982

Abstract

Much of the focus in learning disabilities has centered on elementary-age students, and while the demands and characteristics of instructional programs at the secondary level have been discussed by those who work with LD adolescents, there is no consensus on the degree to which elementary and secondary programs should differ. In this study, a national sample of 53 elementary school teachers and 34 secondary school teachers who provide Level III resource room service to LD students was asked to complete a survey on program planning and implementation practices. Statistical analyses of responses revealed no differences of practical value between the practices of elementary and secondary level teachers. However, there was a great deal of variability within the responses of both groups. Implications of the lack of differences between groups and the presence of variability within groups are discussed.

Instructional Planning and Implementation Practices of Elementary and Secondary Resource Room Teachers: Is There a Difference?

Learning disabilities as a special education service area is a young field, having only come into its own within the last two decades. These years have been characterized by controversy and confusion as educators have struggled with the task of determining how best to serve learning disabled (LD) students. Much of the focus in learning disabilities has centered on work with elementary age students; few programs were available for secondary level LD students before the advent of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142). It has been PL 94-142, with its requirement of provision of services up to age 21 if necessary, that has provided the impetus for the widespread development of secondary level programs. Perhaps due in large part to the haste with which many secondary programs were put together and the fact that almost all work done with LD students initially was with elementary school age children, most secondary school programs might be viewed as stepchildren of elementary programs. Deshler, Lowrey, and Alley (1979) categorized responses to a survey on secondary program service options into five major areas: functional, remedial, tutorial, work study, and learning strategies. Responses to the survey indicated that 45% of the secondary programs fell into the Basic Skills Remediation category--the category described as the most similar to services used with elementary-age students.

The demands and characteristics of secondary level education

frequently are discussed by those who work with learning disabled adolescents (e.g., Deshler, Alley, Warner, Schumaker, & Clark, 1980; Lerner, Evans, & Meyers, 1977; Wiederholt, 1978). Despite the emphasis given by these educators to the need for programs for secondary students, as with elementary programs, there is little consensus on the desired characteristics of such programs. Various approaches have been recommended for teaching the learning disabled adolescent: continuing the basic skills instruction begun in the elementary school (Goodman & Mann, 1976), individual assistance with, and adaptation of, mainstream curriculum (Brown, 1978), instruction in the use of learning strategies (Alley & Deshler, 1979), or use of compensatory approaches (Wiseman & Hartwell, 1980). Despite their differences, there is general agreement among these leaders in the field that elementary programs cannot simply be transferred to secondary settings. Yet, direct comparisons have not been made of the educational practices of elementary and secondary teachers of learning disabled students. The study reported here was an attempt to determine what differences, if any, do exist in the practices of elementary and secondary resource room teachers.

Method

Subjects

Surveys on the planning and implementation of instructional programs were sent to a random sample of 373 members of the Division for Children with Learning Disabilities (now named the Council for Learning Disabilities), Council for Exceptional Children. Completed surveys were returned by 128 teachers of learning disabled students.

Of these 128 teachers, 87 (68%) indicated that they provided Level III (part-time, up to 4 hours per day) service; the survey responses from these 87 resource room teachers were used in the current investigation.

Eight of the subjects included in this study were male; 78 were female. The majority of the teachers (72%) indicated that they held at least a master's degree in education; the average number of years spent as a special education teacher was 5.7. There were 53 elementary school (grades 1-6) teachers and 34 secondary school teachers in this group of 87 subjects. The 53 elementary school teachers represented 71% of the total number of elementary school teachers responding to the survey; the 34 secondary level teachers represented 74% of all secondary teachers completing the survey.

Materials

Data for this study were obtained from the program planning and implementation survey developed by Mirkin and Potter (1982). The survey consisted of eight sections: (a) school and teacher information, (b) student information, (c) selection of IEP goals and objectives, (d) program description, (e) determinants of the program, (f) changes in the original instructional plan, (g) evaluation of progress, and (h) miscellaneous. A supplementary form to be used in response selection accompanied the survey. (The survey and supplementary form may be found in Appendix A.)

Procedure

Surveys were mailed to 373 randomly selected members of the Council for Exceptional Children's Council for Learning Disabilities

(CLD) in the late spring of the 1980-1981 school year. Teachers were asked to complete the survey with the program of only one of their students in mind. Each teacher was provided with a randomly selected number between 1 and 15; teachers with caseloads of approximately 15 students were asked to use this number to determine which student's program they would have in mind as they completed the survey. Teachers who did not have approximately 15 students were asked to devise an alternate method for random selection of the student whose program they would describe. Teachers completed survey items either by filling in a blank (where appropriate, response options were provided from which they could choose) or by checking responses representative of their practices with the individual student.

Data Analysis

For purposes of data analyses, responses to items in Part C (Selection of IEP Goals and Objectives), Part E (Determinants of the Program), and Part G (Evaluation of Progress) of the survey were grouped into categories after the surveys were completed and returned. Four categories of responses were formed for Sections C and G, and five categories were formed for Section E of the survey. Table 1 lists each category with its component items. Several survey items allowed subjects to indicate a first, second, and third choice or asked the subject to indicate which of the instructional materials, methods, motivational strategies, or uses of evaluation information listed were relied on most. For these items, only the first choice or major use were considered in this investigation. To compare the responses of the elementary and secondary teachers, *t* tests and chi-

square tests were run where appropriate. Data not meeting the assumptions of either type of statistic were examined in a descriptive manner.

Insert Table 1 about here

Results

Results from the survey provided data on (a) teacher and student characteristics, (b) program description, (c) bases for program decisions, (d) evaluation practices, and (e) program satisfaction/ attributions for success. Not all respondents completed all items on the survey; thus, the results reported below are based on varying numbers of subjects.

Teacher and Student Characteristics

Teacher characteristics. Descriptive information for the two groups of teachers is outlined in Table 2. This information includes sex of teacher, number of years of experience teaching special education, highest educational degree obtained, number of students provided direct service, and number of students provided indirect service. There were no significant differences between elementary and secondary teachers for any of these descriptors.

Insert Table 2 about here

Student characteristics. The average age of the elementary level students selected from the teachers' caseloads was 9.5 years (SD =

1.53, range = 6-12); the average age of the secondary level students was 15.3 years (SD = 1.64, range = 13-18). There was no significant difference between the race distributions of the elementary and secondary students. Information was available on the year the student started receiving special education services for 49 elementary students and 29 secondary students. While 9 (31%) of these secondary students had been receiving services for two years or less, 40 (82%) of the elementary students started receiving special education services in the two years preceding the date of the survey. This difference was statistically significant [$\chi^2(9) = 33.0$, $p < .001$]. There was no significant difference between groups in the length of time since the most recent IEP had been written.

Program Description

The amount of time students were reported to receive services in various academic areas is shown in Table 3. The differences between the groups were not significant. When t tests were run using square root transformations of the raw data to control for variability, there still were no significant differences between groups in the amount of time instruction was provided in the various areas.

Insert Table 3 about here

Teachers were asked to indicate whether instruction provided to the student in reading, math, spelling, written language, and/or other areas was in place of or supplementary to classroom instruction. The only area in which there was a significant difference in the nature of

elementary and secondary instruction was in written language. Secondary level teachers generally indicated that resource room instruction in written language was supplementary while elementary teachers indicated resource room instruction was in place of classsroom instruction [$\chi^2(2) = 6.08$, $p < .05$].

The materials, methods, and motivational strategies that subjects indicated they relied on most in reading, math, spelling, and "other subjects" are listed in Tables 4, 5, and 6. Because of the numerous categories and the relatively few subjects responding within each category, statistical tests were not run on these data. Informal examination of the data suggested that there were relatively few differences between the elementary and secondary teachers in the methods and motivational strategies used with their students. With regard to materials, it appeared that secondary teachers in this sample relied more heavily on commercial programs in reading and consumables in spelling than did the elementary teachers. Elementary teachers' responses were more varied than those of the secondary teachers in the types of materials they reportedly relied on for reading, and they indicated more often than the secondary teachers that they relied on a classroom text to teach spelling.

Insert Tables 4-6 about here

Bases for Program Decisions

Subjects were asked to indicate the most influential factors in determining long-term goals and short-term objectives for the student

whose program was being described. These responses were categorized into four areas: tests, observation, consultation, and constraints (see Table 1). Chi-square analyses revealed no significant differences between the elemeniary and secondary teachers in the frequency with which they reported that various factors influenced either their long-term goals or short-term objectives. Similarly, there were no significant differences in the factors reported to be most influential in determining the amount of time the student received services, or in determining the materials, methods, and motivational strategies used with the student.

Teachers were asked to use a four-point scale (1 = very unlikely, 2 = unlikely, 3 = likely, and 4 = very likely) to indicate how likely they were to make changes in (a) materials, (b) methods, (c) motivational strategies, and (d) time allocation, student-teacher ratio, etc.; *t* tests revealed no differences between the two groups in their reported likelihood of making changes in any of these areas. Both groups indicated that they were somewhat more likely to make changes in materials, methods, and motivations, than to make changes in time, student-teacher ratio, etc.

Evaluation Practices

Responses to the portion of the survey on methods of pupil evaluation were grouped into five categories: formal tests, informal tests, observation of performance, consultation, and other. The general pattern of choices of methods of evaluation was not different for elementary and secondary teachers. In the areas of reading and math, no single type of evaluation appeared to be preferred over the

others by either the elementary or secondary teachers. In spelling, both groups emphasized informal tests, and in written language observation was listed as the preferred evaluation method.

Uses of evaluation information listed by survey respondents were grouped into three categories: discuss/consult, teacher actions, and monitor/grades. A chi-square analysis revealed no differences between the elementary and secondary teachers in how they used evaluation information. The items included in each category and the distribution of teacher responses are listed in Table 7.

Insert Table 7 about here

Program Evaluation

On a scale of one to four (1 = very dissatisfied, 2 = dissatisfied, 3 = satisfied, 4 = very satisfied), subjects were asked to indicate their degree of satisfaction with the student's program in terms of (a) materials available, (b) amount of instructional time, (c) methods being used, (d) ability to monitor progress, and (e) the student's progress. Overall, teachers reported satisfaction with the student's current program and progress; *t* tests showed no differences between the levels of satisfaction of elementary and secondary teachers.

The final question of the survey asked subjects to rank order six items in terms of their perceived importance in the progress achieved by the target student by the time of the annual review (see Table 8 for a list of the items). None of the subjects in either group viewed

the material being used as the main reason for progress; there were no significant differences in the rankings of the other five items by the elementary and the secondary teachers.

Insert Table 8 about here

Discussion

The results of this investigation indicate that for this particular group of teachers there were few differences in the program planning and implementation practices of elementary and secondary level teachers. The overriding characteristics of the responses of both the elementary and secondary teachers was variability, even though all were providing Level III service. While there were only a moderate number of teachers involved in this study, as members of a national professional organization, many with advanced degrees, these teachers represent a group whose responses should reflect current trends in the field.

Few people would argue that adolescents are no different than elementary school age children; in fact, the majority of American schools use a different format of education for their mainstream secondary students than they use for elementary students. Any argument for or against different educational approaches for elementary and secondary LD students must balance consideration of the student as a person with difficulties in one or more of the basic skill areas against consideration of the number of years of school remaining for the student. If the major purpose of the educational

system is to provide minimum competency in the basic skill areas of reading, math, and spelling, then concentration on the basic skills through high school, for those who have difficulty in these areas, is appropriate. If, on the other hand, the major purpose of the school is to prepare the student for life after he/she leaves school, then by the time the student reaches high school, the basic skills approach may need to be secondary to an emphasis on vocational training, problem solving skills, life skills, and general knowledge content. Support for this second approach comes from the epidemiological study done by the Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities at the University of Kansas (Warner, Alley, Schumaker, Deshler, & Clark, 1980). Their study suggests that learning disabled adolescents tend to plateau in their achievement level, and that even with continued basic skills instruction, they gain little in the way of basic skills between eighth and twelfth grades.

The variability, so evident in all areas of this survey, appears to reflect the variations in definitions of LD currently in use, as well as the variations in philosophy regarding how best to teach LD students. Variability in educational programs is not, in and of itself, good or bad. Teachers always have known that the same method of teaching is not equally effective for all children. If variability reflects instructional methods that have been empirically tested and shown to be differentially effective for individual students, then variability is desirable. However, if variability reflects confusion in the field and arbitrary use of a multitude of non-validated interventions procedures, then variability is not desirable. In a

review of interventions currently in use in special education, Ysseldyke and Algozzine (1982) conclude that:

> the decisions to use particular interventions on students should be based on evidence that the intervention is effective....Although we do not have evidence that specific curricula are universally effective, many data support the contention that interventions must be designed for the individual and monitored frequently to ensure their effectiveness. Intervention is equivalent to research and is a process of hypothesis testing. (p. 164)

The results of the present survey indicate that aside from the initial development of the Individual Education Plan (IEP), objective evaluation information generally is not used to make ongoing instructional decisions. Rather, teachers reported that decisions to make changes in the student's program were based on subjective information (e.g., "personal observation"). Many of the evaluation methods reported to be used with students were subjective in nature and the use of evaluation information generally was said to be for consultative purposes (talk to student, teacher, parent, etc.) or monitoring (grades, etc.), rather than directly to guide teacher actions.

Learning disabilities is a young field and programs for secondary LD students are a recent phenomenon. There are no known, universally applicable, effective approaches for teaching LD students. Teachers of LD students hold different beliefs about what "learning disabilities" are and how best to intervene with LD students (Thurlow & Ysseldyke, 1982). The results of the present study indicate that there is in fact a wide variety of instructional approaches being used with LD students of all ages. Now that programs have been established for these students, it is important that educators make a concerted effort to determine how to serve these

students most effectively, taking into account not only specific academic difficulties, but also the developmental, social, and emotional needs of the student.

References

Alley, G., & Deshler, D. Teaching the learning disabled adolescent: Strategies and methods. Denver: Love, 1979.

Brown, V. Curriculum development resources. In L. Mann, L. Goodman & J. L. Wiederholt (Eds.), Teaching the learning disabled adolescent. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1978.

Deshler, D., Alley, G., Warner, M., Schumaker, J., & Clark, F. An epidemiological study of learning disabled adolescents in secondary schools: Support services (Research Report No. 19). Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Institute for Research in Learning Disabilities, 1980.

Deshler, D., Lowrey, N., & Alley, G. Programming alternatives for learning disabled adolescents: A nationwide survey. Academic Therapy, 1979, 14, 389-397.

Goodman, L., & Mann, L. Learning disabilities in the secondary school: Issues and practices. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1976.

Lerner, J., Evans, M., & Meyers, G. LD programs at the secondary level: A survey. Academic Therapy, 1977, 13, 7-19.

Mirkin, P., & Potter, M. A survey of program planning and implementation practices of LD teachers (Research Report, in preparation). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities, 1982.

Thurlow, M., & Ysseldyke, J. Teacher's beliefs about LD students. (Research Report No. 66) Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities, 1982.

Warner, M., Alley, G., Schumaker, J., Deshler, D., & Clark, F. An epidemiological study of learning disabled adolescents in secondary schools: Achievement and ability, socioeconomic status, and school experiences (Research Report No. 13). Lawrence, Kan.: University of Kansas, Institute for Research in Learning Disabilities, 1980.

Wiederholt, J. L. Adolescents with learning disabilities: The problem in perspective. In L. Mann, L. Goodman, & J. L. Wiederholt (Eds.), Teaching the learning disabled adolescent. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1978.

Wiseman, D. E., & Hartwell (Meyers), L. K. The poor reader in secondary schools: An alternative curriculum. Academic Therapy, 1980, 15, 613-624.

Ysseldyke, J., & Algozzine, B. Critical issues in special and remedial education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1982.

Table 1

Sources of Information, Influential Factors, and Types of Evaluation: Items by Category 15

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Tests

- Overall scores on ability tests
- Overall scores on achievement tests
- Pattern of scores on ability tests
- Pattern of scores on achievement tests
- Discrepancies between ability and achievement tests
- Other standardized assessments
- Performance on criterion-referenced measures

Observation of Performance

- Progress on previous IEP objectives
- Informal assessments done during previous instruction
- Other informal assessments
- Personal observation of student performance
- Behavioral observations/information

Consultation

- Classroom teacher's priorities
- Parental input/priorities
- Input of other team members

Constraints

- Constraints of times, materials, teachers available
- District policies
- A commercial or locally constructed list of long-term goals, short-term objectives, and/or instructional suggestions

INFLUENTIAL FACTORS

Test Based and Objective Information

- Demonstrated ability on psychological tests
- Performance on standardized tests
- Performance on informal measures
- Formal observation
- Medical information (hearing, medications, etc.)

Classroom Information

- Referring teacher's statement of original referral problem
- Classroom teacher's comments on classroom progress
- Classroom teacher's requests
- Material covered by regular classroom

Experiential Factors

- Student characteristics (e.g., attention span, motivation, social skills, etc.)
- Past experience with student
- Past experience with students with similar problems
- College coursework, professional journals, workshops, etc.

Constraints

- Materials available
- Your caseload
- Rest of student's schedule
- Other students taught at same time
- Policy of lead teacher/school/district
- Instructor's guide(s) for text(s)

Consultation/Family Information

- Family information
- Consultation with others (aside from classroom teacher and parents)
- Parent requests

TYPES OF EVALUATION

Formal Tests

- Standardized achievement tests
- Standardized diagnostic measures
- District developed tests
- Basal text mastery tests
- Formal observation

Informal Tests

- Criterion referenced measures
- Direct and frequent measurement (precision teaching-type)
- Teacher-made tests/oral quizzes
- Oral, silent timings
- Check number of short-term objectives mastered

Observation of Performance

- Scoring workbooks
- Scoring worksheets
- Amount of work completed
- Number of correct flashcards
- Listening to oral reading
- Informal observation of student performance

Consultation

- Consultation with classroom teacher regarding classroom performance

Table 2

Descriptive Information for Elementary and Secondary Level Teachers

	Elementary	Secondary
Sex		
Male	7.5%	12.1%
Female	92.5%	87.9%
Highest Degree		
BA/AB	24.6%	33.3%
MA/MS	73.5%	54.5%
EdS/ABD	1.9%	12.2%
Mean Number of Years in Special Education[a]	5.7 (3.5)	5.8 (3.0)
Mean Number of Students Served[a]		
Direct Service	19.1 (6.5)	21.8(11.3)
Indirect Service	23.2(64.4)	8.1(12.1)

[a]Numbers in parentheses are standard deviations.

Table 3

Percentages of Students Receiving Special Education Services in Various Academic Areas and Average Amount of Time Spent within Each Area[a]

Academic Area	Elementary			Secondary		
	%[b]	$\bar{X}$	SD	%[b]	$\bar{X}$	SD
Reading	90.0	39.7	21.5	80.6	35.5	21.1
Math	50.9	34.4	17.6	71.0	38.7	17.9
Spelling	58.5	19.7	8.7	71.0	20.9	16.6
Written Language	58.5	20.3	12.1	64.5	25.9	23.4
Other	30.2	35.7	43.6	48.3	45.9	49.0

[a]Times are calculated on the basis of instruction five days per week.

[b]Percentages are based on the number of elementary (n=53) and secondary students (n=31) reported to be receiving instruction in each academic area.

Table 4

Percentages of Teachers Listing Various Types of Materials as Most Used Within Academic Areas

	Elementary	Secondary
Materials - Reading	(n=29)	(n=22)
Classroom Text	13.8	4.5
Other Texts	17.2	13.7
Commercial Program	24.1	50.0
Local Program	13.8	4.5
Consumables	6.9	13.7
Manipulables	13.8	4.5
Others	10.4	9.1
Materials - Math	(n=18)	(n=17)
Classroom Text	33.3	23.4
Other Texts	5.6	17.7
Commercial Program	5.6	17.7
Local Program	33.3	17.7
Consumables	16.6	17.7
Manipulables	5.6	0.0
Others	0.0	5.8
Materials - Spelling	(n=23)	(n=19)
Classroom Text	43.5	10.5
Other Texts	4.3	0.0
Commercial Program	4.3	26.3
Local Program	26.1	5.3
Consumables	8.7	42.1
Manipulables	4.3	0.0
Others	8.7	15.8
Materials - Other Subjects	(n=8)	(n=6)
Classroom Text	12.5	50.0
Other Texts	12.5	0.0
Commercial Program	37.5	0.0
Local Program	37.5	0.0
Consumables	0.0	50.0
Manipulables	0.0	0.0

Table 5

Percentages of Teachers Listing Various Types of Methods as Most Used Within Academic Areas

	Elementary	Secondary
Methods - Reading	(n=25)	(n=12)
Subskills	64.0	50.0
Practice	20.0	25.0
Modality	0.0	8.3
Modeling	8.0	0.0
Games	4.0	8.3
Other	4.0	8.3
Methods - Math	(n=13)	(n=14)
Subskills	69.2	50.0
Practice	15.4	21.4
Modality	7.7	0.0
Modeling	0.0	21.4
Games	7.7	7.1
Other	0.0	0.0
Methods - Spelling	(n=17)	(n=11)
Subskills	35.3	36.4
Practice	35.3	54.5
Modality	11.8	9.1
Modeling	5.9	0.0
Games	11.8	0.0
Other	0.0	0.0
Methods - Other Areas	(n=9)	(n=4)
Subskills	22.2	50.0
Practice	22.2	0.0
Modality	22.2	0.0
Modeling	11.1	25.0
Games	22.2	25.0
Other	0.0	0.0

Table 6

Percentages of Teachers Listing Various Types of Motivational Strategies as Most Used Within Academic Areas

	Elementary	Secondary
Motivation - Reading	(n=37)	(n=23)
Social	43.3	43.5
Activity	5.4	8.7
Concrete	2.7	4.4
Indirect	16.2	13.0
Contracts	13.5	8.7
Self-Management	10.8	21.7
Punishment	8.1	0.0
Motivation - Math	(n=20)	(n=16)
Social	50.0	50.0
Activity	5.0	12.5
Concrete	10.0	6.2
Indirect	10.0	12.5
Contracts	0.0	0.0
Self-Management	5.0	18.8
Punishment	20.0	0.0
Motivation - Spelling	(n=16)	(n=11)
Social	62.5	63.6
Activity	6.2	9.1
Concrete	0.0	18.2
Indirect	25.0	9.1
Contracts	0.0	0.0
Self-Management	6.2	0.0
Punishment	0.0	0.0
Motivation - Other	(n=6)	(n=9)
Social	50.0	33.4
Activity	0.0	22.2
Concrete	0.0	11.1
Indirect	50.0	11.1
Contracts	0.0	11.1
Self-Management	0.0	11.1
Punishment		

Table 7

Percentages of Elementary and Secondary Teachers Listing Major Use of Evaluation Information Within Categories

	Elementary	Secondary
Discuss/Consult	46.8%	45.0%
Discuss progress with student		
Discuss progress with parent		
Discuss progress with teacher		
Consult with lead teacher, principal, special ed director		
Review progress with team		
Send notes home		
Teacher Actions	37.5%	20.0%
Change instructional plan		
Decide to review/reteach		
Modify goals and objectives		
Monitor/Grades	15.7%	35.0%
Monitor progress		
Assign grades		
Total number responding	(32)	(20)

Table 8

Reasons Cited by Teachers for Student Progress

- Instructional approach used
- Material used
- Additional instruction time spent in target areas
- Lower student teacher ratio
- Increased student motivation
- Ability to monitor student progress closely and to make changes when needed

APPENDIX A

Copy of Survey and Supplementary Form

PROGRAM PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY

PART A | SCHOOL AND TEACHER INFORMATION

Type of School: _____Rural _____Suburban _____Urban

_____Elementary _____Middle/Jr. High _____Secondary/Senior High

Teacher Information: _____Female _____Male

How many years have you taught Special Education students?_____

Please identify the highest degree you hold_____

Approximately how many children do you serve each day?

Number served: _____Direct service _____Indirect service

For the remainder of the survey, respond to items while keeping in mind the program of the student selected according to the attached directions.

PART B | STUDENT INFORMATION

1. For this particular student: _____Age _____Grade _____Race
2. Month and year Special Education service began_____
3. Month and year you started working with this student_____
4. Date the current Individual Educational Plan (IEP) was written_____
5. Date of the last IEP periodic review_____
6. What level of service do you provide this student? Circle one.

   Level:

   I - Monitoring
   II - Consultation
   III - Direct service - up to 4 hours/day
   IV - Direct service - more than 4 hours/day
   V - All day, self-contained
   VI - Special School/Residential

7. How much Special Education service does this student receive in the following areas:

Area	# Min/day	#Days/wk	Area	# Min/day	# Days/wk
Reading	_____	_____	Written Language	_____	_____
Math	_____	_____	Other	_____	_____
Spelling	_____	_____	(Specify):_____		

8. What are the criteria for a student to be classified as learning disabled in your school/district?

PART C SELECTION OF IEP GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

If you were not involved in writing this student's IEP, skip this part and go on to PART D.

Use the items listed in Section C of the accompanying form (the blue sheet) to respond to the following questions. Please rank order your answers from most important to least important.

What sources of information do you feel were the most important in determining -

a. Long term goals:

Item #_____, _____, _____

If "Other," #19, was used, please specify:_____

b. Short term objectives:

Item #_____, _____, _____

If "Other," #19, was used, please specify:_____

PART D PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

1. For each area listed below, check whether the instruction you provide is in place of or supplementary to classroom instruction.

Area	In place of	Supplementary	Area	In place of	Supplementary
Reading	_____	_____	Written Language	_____	_____
Math	_____	_____	Other (specify):_____	_____	_____
Spelling	_____	_____			

For questions 2, 3, and 4, within each area in which you provide instruction, please asterisk (*) the material, method, and motivational strategy you rely on the most with this student. Check (√) anything else used regularly within each academic area.

2. Material	Examples	Reading	Math	Spelling	Other ( )
Child's classroom text		_____	_____	_____	_____
Other standard texts		_____	_____	_____	_____
Commercial programs	DISTAR, Frostig, KeyMath	_____	_____	_____	_____
Locally developed programs	Math/reading programs	_____	_____	_____	_____
Consumables	Workbooks, worksheets	_____	_____	_____	_____
Manipulables	Cuisinaire rods, flannel board	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other (specify):_____		_____	_____	_____	_____

3. Method	Examples	Reading	Math	Spelling	Other ( )
Work on subskills	Regrouping in subtraction Syllabication Comprehension skills	____	____	____	____
Practice	Oral reading practice Writing times tables Isolated word practice Writing in journals	____	____	____	____
Modality training	VAKT (visual, auditory kinesthetic, tactile)	____	____	____	____
Modeling	Student listens to selection before reading Student reads while teacher reads Student imitates solving of math problem	____	____	____	____
Games and machinery	Tape recorder Language master Computer games	____	____	____	____
Other (specify):_____		____	____	____	____

4. Motivation	Examples	Reading	Math	Spelling	Other ( )
Social reinforcers	Verbal praise, posted praise, working with friend, positive note home	____	____	____	____
Activity reinforcers	Use typewriter, have free time have early dismissal, be office assistant, do favorite school work	____	____	____	____
Concrete reinforcers	Candy, stars, stickers, money school materials	____	____	____	____
Indirect reinforcers	Earn points, tokens, checkmarks, etc., to trade in for a reinforcer	____	____	____	____
Contracts	Between student and teacher; between student, teacher, and parent	____	____	____	____
Self-management strategies	Having student charting his/her own data; scoring his/her own tests; self-monitoring of time on task	____	____	____	____
Punishment procedures	Time out, response cost, error correction, sad faces, red checkmarks, fines	____	____	____	____
Other (specify):_____		____	____	____	____

Over, please

PART E DETERMINANTS OF THE PROGRAM

Use the items listed in Section E of the blue form to respond to the following questions. Please rank order your answers from most important to least important.

What factors have been most influential in determining -

a. The amount of time the student receives services:

Item #_____, _____, _____

If "Other," # 23, was used, please specify: _____

b. The materials used:

Item #_____, _____, _____

If "Other," # 23, was used, please specify: _____

c. The methods used:

Item #_____, _____, _____

If "Other," # 23, was used, please specify: _____

d. The motivational strategies used:

Item #_____, _____, _____

If "Other," # 23, was used, please specify: _____

PART F CHANGES IN ORIGINAL INSTRUCTIONAL PLAN

How likely are you to make any changes in your instructional plan for this student between periodic reviews? (See PART D for examples of materials, methods, and motivational strategies.)

	Very Unlikely	Unlikely	Likely	Very Likely
Change materials	1	2	3	4
Change methods	1	2	3	4
Change motivational strategies	1	2	3	4
Change time allocation, student/ teacher ratio, etc.	1	2	3	4

Generally, what is the basis for your decision to make changes, or not to make changes, in this student's program? Rank order, please.

_____objective performance data

_____personal observation of student progress

_____external constraints (scheduling, changes in classroom curriculum, etc.)

_____other (specify): _____

PART G EVALUATION OF PROGRESS

Use the items listed in Section G of the blue form to respond to question 1.

1. What, if any, type of evaluation information do you collect in each of the areas in which you provide instruction? Please rank order your answers from most important to least important and indicate the frequency with which you use each form of evaluation (e.g., daily, 2X/week, monthly, etc.)

Area	Type of Evaluation (List item #)	Frequency
Reading	1._____	_____
	2._____	_____
	3._____	_____
Math	1._____	_____
	2._____	_____
	3._____	_____
Spelling	1._____	_____
	2._____	_____
	3._____	_____
Written Language	1._____	_____
	2._____	_____
	3._____	_____
Other (specify)	1._____	_____
_____	2._____	_____
	3._____	_____

2. Where do you record information about this student's performance/progress?

_____No written records kept _____Checklists

_____Charts and/or graphs _____File samples of work

_____Grade book _____Other (specify):_____

3. Of the total amount of instructional and preparatory time devoted to this student, what percentage would you estimate you spend in performance/progress evaluation activities? Circle one.

up to 10% 11-20% 21-30% 31-45% 46-60% 61-75% more than 75%

Under ideal conditions, would you like to see this percentage of time:

_____increased _____stay the same _____decreased

Over, please

4. How is evaluation information used with this student? Please asterisk (*) the major use and check (✓) any others that apply. Also, indicate the approximate frequency of each use.

	Frequency
_____Not used	_____
_____Discuss progress with student	_____
_____Discuss progress with parent	_____
_____Discuss progress with regular classroom teacher	_____
_____Consult with lead teacher, principal, special education director, etc.	_____
_____Send notes home	_____
_____Change instructional plan (materials, methods, etc.)	_____
_____Decide when to review, reteach	_____
_____Monitor progress on IEP goals and objectives	_____
_____Review progress with team	_____
_____Modify IEP goals and objectives	_____
_____Assign grades	_____
_____Other (specify):_____	_____

PART H MISCELLANEOUS

1. How satisfied are you with this student's program in terms of:

	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
a. Materials available	1	2	3	4
b. Amount of instructional time	1	2	3	4
c. Methods you are using	1	2	3	4
d. Ability to monitor progress	1	2	3	4
e. The student's progress	1	2	3	4

2. If this student has made appreciable progress by the time of the annual review, to what do you think this will mainly be due? Please rank order.

_____The instructional approach used

_____The material used

_____The additional instruction time spent in target areas

_____The lower student/teacher ratio

_____Increased student motivation

_____Ability to closely monitor student progress and make changes when needed

3. We welcome any comments you have on this survey or the instructional or evaluation process in general.

Use the following items in responding to questions in Part C, E, and G of the survey. The sections on this form are labeled to correspond with the portion of the survey for which those items are appropriate. These lists are by no means exhaustive. Please feel free to use the category "other"; we just ask that you specify what "other" stands for in the appropriate space on the survey itself.

Section C — Sources of Information

1. Overall scores on ability tests
2. Overall scores on achievement tests
3. Pattern of scores on ability tests
4. Pattern of scores on achievement tests
5. Discrepancies between ability and achievement tests
6. Other standardized assessments
7. Performance on criterion-referenced measures
8. Progress on previous IEP objectives
9. Informal assessments done during previous instruction
10. Other informal assessments
11. Personal observation of student performance
12. Behavioral observations/information
13. Classroom teacher's priorities
14. Parental input/priorities
15. Input of other team members
16. Constraints of times, materials, teachers available
17. District policies
18. A commercial or locally constructed list of long-term goals, short-term objectives, and/or instructional suggestions
19. Other

Section E — Influential Factors

1. Demonstrated ability on psychological tests
2. Performance on standardized tests
3. Performance on informal measures
4. Formal observation
5. Medical information (hearing, medications, etc.)
6. Family information
7. Referring teacher's statement of original referral problem
8. Classroom teacher's comments on classroom progress
9. Classroom teacher's requests
10. Material covered by regular classroom
11. Student characteristics (e.g., attention span, motivation, social skills, etc.)
12. Past experience with student
13. Past experience with students with similar problems
14. Materials available
15. Your caseload
16. Rest of student's schedule
17. Other students taught at same time
18. Policy of lead teacher/school/district
19. Instructor's guide(s) for text(s)
20. Consultation with others (aside from classroom teacher and parents)
21. Parent requests
22. College coursework, professional journals, workshops, etc.
23. Other

Section G — Types of Evaluation

1. Standardized achievement tests
2. Standardized diagnostic measures
3. District developed tests
4. Basal text mastery tests
5. Criterion referenced measures
6. Direct and frequent measurement (precision teaching-type)
7. Teacher-made tests/oral quizzes
8. Scoring workbooks
9. Scoring worksheets
10. Amount of work completed
11. Number of correct flashcards
12. Listening to oral reading
13. Oral, silent timings
14. Informal observation of student performance
15. Formal observation
16. Consultation with classroom teacher regarding classroom performance
17. Check number of short-term objectives mastered
18. Other

PUBLICATIONS

Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities
University of Minnesota

The Institute is not funded for the distribution of its publications. Publications may be obtained for $3.00 per document, a fee designed to cover printing and postage costs. Only checks and money orders payable to the University of Minnesota can be accepted. All orders must be prepaid.

Requests should be directed to: Editor, IRLD, 350 Elliott Hall; 75 East River Road, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455.

Ysseldyke, J. E. Assessing the learning disabled youngster: The state of the art (Research Report No. 1). November, 1977.

Ysseldyke, J. E., & Regan, R. R. Nondiscriminatory assessment and decision making (Monograph No. 7). February, 1979.

Foster, G., Algozzine, B., & Ysseldyke, J. Susceptibility to stereotypic bias (Research Report No. 3). March, 1979.

Algozzine, B. An analysis of the disturbingness and acceptability of behaviors as a function of diagnostic label (Research Report No. 4). March, 1979.

Algozzine, B., & McGraw, K. Diagnostic testing in mathematics: An extension of the PIAT? (Research Report No. 5). March, 1979.

Deno, S. L. A direct observation approach to measuring classroom behavior: Procedures and application (Research Report No. 6). April, 1979.

Ysseldyke, J. E., & Mirkin, P. K. Proceedings of the Minnesota roundtable conference on assessment of learning disabled children (Monograph No. 8). April, 1979.

Somwaru, J. P. A new approach to the assessment of learning disabilities (Monograph No. 9). April, 1979.

Algozzine, B., Forgnone, C., Mercer, C. D., & Trifiletti, J. J. Toward defining discrepancies for specific learning disabilities: An analysis and alternatives (Research Report No. 7). June, 1979.

Algozzine, B. The disturbing child: A validation report (Research Report No. 8). June, 1979.

Note: Monographs No. 1 - 6 and Research Report No. 2 are not available for distribution. These documents were part of the Institute's 1979-1980 continuation proposal, and/or are out of print.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., Regan, R., & Potter, M. Technical adequacy of tests used by professionals in simulated decision making (Research Report No. 9). July, 1979.

Jenkins, J. R., Deno, S. L., & Mirkin, P. K. Measuring pupil progress toward the least restrictive environment (Monograph No. 10). August, 1979.

Mirkin, P. K., & Deno, S. L. Formative evaluation in the classroom: An approach to improving instruction (Research Report No. 10). August, 1979.

Thurlow, M. L., & Ysseldyke, J. E. Current assessment and decision-making practices in model programs for the learning disabled (Research Report No. 11). August, 1979.

Deno, S. L., Chiang, B., Tindal, G., & Blackburn, M. Experimental analysis of program components: An approach to research in CSDC's (Research Report No. 12). August, 1979.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., Shinn, M., & McGue, M. Similarities and differences between underachievers and students labeled learning disabled: Identical twins with different mothers (Research Report No. 13). September, 1979.

Ysseldyke, J., & Algozzine, R. Perspectives on assessment of learning disabled students (Monograph No. 11). October, 1979.

Poland, S. F., Ysseldyke, J. E., Thurlow, M. L., & Mirkin, P. K. Current assessment and decision-making practices in school settings as reported by directors of special education (Research Report No. 14). November, 1979.

McGue, M., Shinn, M., & Ysseldyke, J. Validity of the Woodcock-Johnson psycho-educational battery with learning disabled students (Research Report No. 15). November, 1979.

Deno, S., Mirkin, P., & Shinn, M. Behavioral perspectives on the assessment of learning disabled children (Monograph No. 12). November, 1979.

Sutherland, J. H., Algozzine, B., Ysseldyke, J. E., & Young, S. What can I say after I say LD? (Research Report No. 16). December, 1979.

Deno, S. L., & Mirkin, P. K. Data-based IEP development: An approach to substantive compliance (Monograph No. 13). December, 1979.

Ysseldyke, J., Algozzine, B., Regan, R., & McGue, M. The influence of test scores and naturally-occurring pupil characteristics on psycho-educational decision making with children (Research Report No. 17). December, 1979.

Algozzine, B., & Ysseldyke, J. E. Decision makers' prediction of students' academic difficulties as a function of referral information (Research Report No. 18). December, 1979.

Ysseldyke, J. E., & Algozzine, B. Diagnostic classification decisions as a function of referral information (Research Report No. 19). January, 1980.

Deno, S. L., Mirkin, P. K., Chiang, B., & Lowry, L. Relationships among simple measures of reading and performance on standardized achievement tests (Research Report No. 20). January, 1980.

Deno, S. L., Mirkin, P. K., Lowry, L., & Kuehnle, K. Relationships among simple measures of spelling and performance on standardized achievement tests (Research Report No. 21). January, 1980.

Deno, S. L., Mirkin, P. K., & Marston, D. Relationships among simple measures of written expression and performance on standardized achievement tests (Research Report No. 22). January, 1980.

Mirkin, P. K., Deno, S. L., Tindal, G., & Kuehnle, K. Formative evaluation: Continued development of data utilization systems (Research Report No. 23). January, 1980.

Deno, S. L., Mirkin, P. K., Robinson, S., & Evans, P. Relationships among classroom observations of social adjustment and sociometric rating scales (Research Report No. 24). January, 1980.

Thurlow, M. L., & Ysseldyke, J. E. Factors influential on the psychoeducational decisions reached by teams of educators (Research Report No. 25). February, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J. E., & Algozzine, B. Diagnostic decision making in individuals susceptible to biasing information presented in the referral case folder (Research Report No. 26). March, 1980.

Thurlow, M. L., & Greener, J. W. Preliminary evidence on information considered useful in instructional planning (Research Report No. 27). March, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Regan, R. R., & Schwartz, S. Z. The use of technically adequate tests in psychoeducational decision making (Research Report No. 28). April, 1980.

Richey, L., Potter, M., & Ysseldyke, J. Teachers' expectations for the siblings of learning disabled and non-learning disabled students: A pilot study (Research Report No. 29). May, 1980.

Thurlow, M. L., & Ysseldyke, J. E. Instructional planning: Information collected by school psychologists vs. information considered useful by teachers (Research Report No. 30). June, 1980.

Algozzine, B., Webber, J., Campbell, M., Moore, S., & Gilliam, J. Classroom decision making as a function of diagnostic labels and perceived competence (Research Report No. 31). June, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., Regan, R. R., Potter, M., Richey, L., & Thurlow, M. L. Psychoeducational assessment and decision making: A computer-simulated investigation (Research Report No. 32). July, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., Regan, R. R., Potter, M., & Richey, L. Psychoeducational assessment and decision making: Individual case studies (Research Report No. 33). July, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., Regan, R., Potter, M., & Richey, L. Technical supplement for computer-simulated investigations of the psychoeducational assessment and decision-making process (Research Report No. 34). July, 1980.

Algozzine, B., Stevens, L., Costello, C., Beattie, J., & Schmid, R. Classroom perspectives of LD and other special education teachers (Research Report No. 35). July, 1980.

Algozzine, B., Siders, J., Siders, J., & Beattie, J. Using assessment information to plan reading instructional programs: Error analysis and word attack skills (Monograph No. 14). July, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J., Shinn, M., & Epps, S. A comparison of the WISC-R and the Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Cognitive Ability (Research Report No. 36). July, 1980.

Algozzine, B., & Ysseldyke, J. E. An analysis of difference score reliabilities on three measures with a sample of low achieving youngsters (Research Report No. 37). August, 1980.

Shinn, M., Algozzine, B., Marston, D., & Ysseldyke, J. A theoretical analysis of the performance of learning disabled students on the Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery (Research Report No. 38). August, 1980.

Richey, L. S., Ysseldyke, J., Potter, M., Regan, R. R., & Greener, J. Teachers' attitudes and expectations for siblings of learning disabled children (Research Report No. 39). August, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., & Thurlow, M. L. (Eds.). A naturalistic investigation of special education team meetings (Research Report No. 40). August, 1980.

Meyers, B., Meyers, J., & Deno, S. Formative evaluation and teacher decision making: A follow-up investigation (Research Report No. 41). September, 1980.

Fuchs, D., Garwick, D. R., Featherstone, N., & Fuchs, L. S. On the determinants and prediction of handicapped children's differential test performance with familiar and unfamiliar examiners (Research Report No. 42). September, 1980.

Algozzine, B., & Stoller, L. Effects of labels and competence on teachers' attributions for a student (Research Report No. 43). September, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J. E., & Thurlow, M. L. (Eds.). The special education assessment and decision-making process: Seven case studies (Research Report No. 44). September, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., Potter, M., & Regan, A. A descriptive study of students enrolled in a program for the severely learning disabled (Research Report No. 45). September, 1980.

Marston, D. Analysis of subtest scatter on the tests of cognitive ability from the Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery (Research Report No. 46). October, 1980.

Algozzine, B., Ysseldyke, J. E., & Shinn, M. Identifying children with learning disabilities: When is a discrepancy severe? (Research Report No. 47). November, 1980.

Fuchs, L., Tindal, J., & Deno, S. Effects of varying item domain and sample duration on technical characteristics of daily measures in reading (Research Report No. 48). January, 1981.

Marston, D., Lowry, L., Deno, S., & Mirkin, P. An analysis of learning trends in simple measures of reading, spelling, and written expression: A longitudinal study (Research Report No. 49). January, 1981.

Marston, D., & Deno, S. The reliability of simple, direct measures of written expression (Research Report No. 50). January, 1981.

Epps, S., McGue, M., & Ysseldyke, J. E. Inter-judge agreement in classifying students as learning disabled (Research Report No. 51). February, 1981.

Epps, S., Ysseldyke, J. E., & McGue, M. Differentiating LD and non-LD students: "I know one when I see one" (Research Report No. 52). March, 1981.

Evans, P. R., & Peham, M. A. S. Testing and measurement in occupational therapy: A review of current practice with special emphasis on the Southern California Sensory Integration Tests (Monograph No. 15). April, 1981.

Fuchs, L., Wesson, C., Tindal, G., & Mirkin, P. Teacher efficiency in continuous evaluation of IEP goals (Research Report No. 53). June, 1981.

Fuchs, D., Featherstone, N., Garwick, D. R., & Fuchs, L. S. The importance of situational factors and task demands to handicapped children's test performance (Research Report No. 54). June, 1981.

Tindal, G., & Deno, S. L. Daily measurement of reading: Effects of varying the size of the item pool (Research Report No. 55). July, 1981.

Fuchs, L. S., & Deno, S. L. A comparison of teacher judgment, standardized tests, and curriculum-based approaches to reading placement (Research Report No. 56). August, 1981.

Fuchs, L., & Deno, S. The relationship between curriculum-based mastery measures and standardized achievement tests in reading (Research Report No. 57). August, 1981.

Christenson, S., Graden, J., Potter, M., & Ysseldyke, J. Current research on psychoeducational assessment and decision making: Implications for training and practice (Monograph No. 16). September, 1981.

Christenson, S., Ysseldyke, J., & Algozzine, B. Institutional constraints and external pressures influencing referral decisions (Research Report No. 58). October, 1981.

Fuchs, L., Fuchs, D., & Deno, S. Reliability and validity of curriculum-based informal reading inventories (Research Report No. 59). October, 1981.

Algozzine, B., Christenson, S., & Ysseldyke, J. Probabilities associated with the referral-to-placement process (Research Report No. 60). November, 1981.

Tindal, G., Fuchs, L. Christenson, S., Mirkin, P., & Deno, S. The relationship between student achievement and teacher assessment of short- or long-term goals (Research Report No. 61). November, 1981.

Mirkin, P., Fuchs, L., Tindal, G., Christenson, S., & Deno, S. The effect of IEP monitoring strategies on teacher behavior (Research Report No. 62). December, 1981.

Wesson, C., Mirkin, P., & Deno, S. Teachers' use of self instructional materials for learning procedures for developing and monitoring progress on IEP goals (Research Report No. 63). January, 1982.

Fuchs, L., Wesson, C., Tindal, G., Mirkin, P., & Deno, S. Instructional changes, student performance, and teacher preferences: The effects of specific measurement and evaluation procedures (Research Report No. 64). January, 1982.

Potter, M., & Mirkin, P. Instructional planning and implementation practices of elementary and secondary resource room teachers: Is there a difference? (Research Report No. 65). January, 1982.